

Unclassified

COMPETITIVE RANGE BRIE



SAMPLE

Program Title

Name SSET Chair

Name PRAG Chair

Name Contracting Officer

Name Price Analyst

1



Today's Agenda

- Program Overview
- Basis for Award
- Initial Evaluation
- Competitive Range Determination



Purpose

To provide the Source Selection Authority and the Source Selection Advisory Council the results of the initial evaluation and the competitive range determination



The content of this briefing is Source Selection Sensitive and will not be released without the approval of the Source Selection Authority



Unclassified

Source Selection Organization Key Personnel

Mr Tim Beyland
(SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY)

SSAC
Member - Chair
Member 1
Member 2
Member 3
Member 4
Etc.

Name
(SSET CHAIRPERSON)

Technical

Member 1
Member 2
Member 3
Etc.

PRAG

Member 1
Member 2
Member 3
Etc.

Contracting/Cost

Member 1
Member 2
Member 3
Etc.

Source Selection Schedule

**EVENT****DATE**

RFP ISSUED

11 Aug 03

PAST PERFORMANCE RECEIVED

05 Sep 03

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

13 Sep 03

INITIAL EVALUATION COMPLETED

10 Oct 03

INITIAL EVALUATION BRIEFING

20 Oct 03

RELEASE EVALUATION NOTICES

22 Oct 03

DISCUSSIONS COMPLETED

21 Nov 03

CLEARANCE

26 Nov 03

PRE-FPR RELEASE BRIEFING

03 Dec 03

FPR REQUEST

12 Dec 03

FPR RECEIPT

19 Dec 03

SSA FINAL DECISION BRIEFING

08 Jan 04

SSA DECISION

09 Jan 04

CONTRACT AWARD

23 Jan 04



Program Overview

- Program Description
- *Add basic summary description of requirement*



Contract Overview

- *Give some basic contract info including such things as:*
 - *Period of performance*
 - *Contract Type*
 - *Budget Estimate*
 - *Etc.*



Offerors

- OFFERORS
 - Offeror 1
 - Offeror 2
 - Offeror 3
 - Offeror 4
 - Etc.

Offerors Presented In Random Order



Basis for Award

- Best value source selection; integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Past Performance, Proposal Risk, and Cost/Price
- The offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR; meet all requirements of the solicitation; conform to the required terms and conditions; and include all required certifications



Evaluation

The factors and sub-factors listed below are (*list order of importance of factors and subfactors from Section M/SSP*). All other factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more importance than cost/price.

- Factor 1 - Past Performance
- Factor 2 - Mission Capability
 - Subfactor 1
 - Subfactor 2
 - Subfactor 3
 - Etc.
- Factor 3 - Proposal Risk
- Factor 4 - Cost/Price



Evaluation Summary

	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 3	Offeror 4	Offeror 5	Offeror 6	Etc.
Subfactor 1	Blue	Green	Yellow	Red	Blue	Red	Yellow
Proposal Risk	L	M	M	H	L	H	H
Subfactor 2	Green	Blue	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Blue
Proposal Risk	M	L	H	M	H	H	L
Subfactor 3	Blue	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Blue	Red
Proposal Risk	L	M	M	H	H	L	H
Past Performan ce	Significan t Confidenc e	High Confidenc e	High Confidenc e	Significant Confidenc e	High Confidenc e	Confidenc e	Significant Confidenc e
Price/Cost	2,219,953	2,691,674	2,173,001	2,501,196	2,641,542	3,494,394	2,026,9129
Probable	2,310,250	2,691,674	2,173,001	2,501,196	2,649,000	3,941,200	2,587,500




Unclassified

Offeror Evaluation Matrix Summary

	Subfactor 1	Subfactor 2	Subfactor 3
Mission Capability			
Proposal Risk			
Past Performance			
Cost/Price		MPC	



Chart Format (Mission Capability Factor)



On the following slides, for each **FACTOR/SUBFACTOR**, the **STRENGTHS, INADEQUACIES and DEFICIENCIES** reported support the **COLOR RATING**, and the **WEAKNESSES, SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES and DEFICIENCIES** reported support the **PROPOSAL RISK RATING**



THE OFFEROR 1 GROUP



MISSION CAPABILITY & PROPOSAL RISK

Unclassified



The Offeror 1 Group Mission Capability

What Was Offered



The Offeror 1 Group Mission Capability

Prime: The Offeror 1 Group

Offeror 1 Integrated Team

- Offeror 1 - Prime
- Sub 1
- Sub 2
- Sub 3



The Offeror 1 Group Mission Capability

- Proposal Summary/Overview, may be a couple of slides
 - Highlight aspects of proposal without giving an evaluative assessment, for example:
 - *Operates under a Continuous Performance Improvement Program supporting web-based and ISO-9000 compliant management systems*
 - This statement just gives information without saying whether it's good, bad or indifferent.

Unclassified



The Offeror 1 Group Mission Capability

Evaluation



Unclassified

The Offeror 1 Group Evaluation Matrix Summary

	Subfactor 1	Subfactor 2	Subfactor 3
Mission Capability	Blue	Green	Blue
Proposal Risk	Low	Moderate	Low
Past Performance Significant Confidence			
Cost/Price \$2,219,953		MPC \$2,310,249	



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 1 - Title of Subfactor

B
L


Strengths:

- Strength 1 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength 2 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength Etc. – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 1 - Title of Subfactor



Deficiencies:

- Deficiency 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency




The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 1 - Title of Subfactor

Inadequacies:


- Inadequacy 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy





The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 1 - Title of Subfactor



Significant Weaknesses:

- Significant Weakness 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness




The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor

Weaknesses:


- Weakness 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness





The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor



Strengths:

- Strength 1 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength 2 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength Etc. – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength



Unclassified

The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor

2

Deficiencies:

- Deficiency 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency

G

M



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor

Inadequacies:

- Inadequacy 1 – Explain what the inadequacy is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy 2 – Explain what the inadequacy is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy Etc. – Explain what the inadequacy is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy

G

M



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor

Significant Weaknesses:

- Significant Weakness 1 – Explain what the significant weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness 2 – Explain what the significant weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness Etc. – Explain what the significant weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness


G

M



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 2 - Title of Subfactor



Weaknesses:

- Weakness 1 – Explain what the weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness 2 – Explain what the weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness Etc. – Explain what the weakness is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 3 - Title of Subfactor

B
L


Strengths:

- Strength 1 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength 2 – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength
- Strength Etc. – Explain what the strength is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a strength



The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 3 - Title of Subfactor



Deficiencies:

- Deficiency 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency
- Deficiency Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a deficiency




The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 3 - Title of Subfactor

Inadequacies:

- Inadequacy 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy
- Inadequacy Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a inadequacy





The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 3 - Title of Subfactor

B
L

Significant Weaknesses:

- Significant Weakness 1 - Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness 2 - Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness
- Significant Weakness Etc. - Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a significant weakness




The Offeror 1 Group

Sub-factor 3 - Title of Subfactor

Weaknesses:

- Weakness 1 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness 2 – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness
- Weakness Etc. – Explain what the deficiency is
 - Needs to read so that there is enough information to support why this particular aspect is a weakness





PAST PERFORMANCE



Past Performance

- Past Performance Evaluation
 - The PRAG assesses performance confidence for each offeror in relative order of importance
 - Performance confidence evaluates an offeror's present and past work record to establish a confidence rating of their ability to successfully perform as proposed
 - The PRAG for the ABCDEFG source selection assessed performance confidence based on ratings of High Confidence, Significant Confidence, Confidence, Neutral/Unknown Confidence, Little Confidence, or No Confidence

Evaluation Methodology



Obtain Past Performance Information on Each Offeror

Assess Contract Relevancy for Mission Capability & Cost/Price Factors

Assess Contract Performance for Mission Capability & Cost/Price Factors

Review Relevancy and Performance Assessments

Assign PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR Confidence Assessment



Evaluation Methodology

PRAG Relevancy Assessment Methodology

- Conducted relevancy assessments for Mission Capability (Subfactor 1, Subfactor 2 & Subfactor 3) and Cost sub-factors by evaluating each offeror's past performance (Offeror and PRAG identified)
- Each sub-factor relevancy area was assessed for relevancy, recency and performance quality in the areas the offeror cited in their relevancy matrix (*if you use one*)
- Citations that were more relevant and/or recent had a greater impact on the overall relevancy assessment
- The overall assessment for each sub-factor is NOT an average or mathematically applied formula



Sources of Data

- Past Performance Volumes
- Questionnaires
- Telephone Interviews
- CPARs via the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)
- Central Contractor Registration Program
- US Army Corps of Engineers Architect/Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS)
- Company Web Sites
- World Wide Web
- Etc.



Organizing the Data

- PRAG Database
 - Questionnaire Logs and Responses
 - Relevancy Matrix
 - Past performance notebooks
 - Telephone and fax logs



Relevancy Areas

- **Subfactor 1**

1. First set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 1
2. Second set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 1
3. Third set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 1
4. Fourth set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 1
5. Fifth set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 1



Relevancy Areas

- **Subfactor 2**

1. First set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 2
2. Second set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 2
3. Third set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 2



Relevancy Areas

- **Subfactor 3**
 1. First set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 3
 2. Second set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 3
 3. Third set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 3
 4. Fourth set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 3
 5. Fifth set of details about what was specifically assessed under Subfactor 3
- **Cost/Price**
 - Details about what was specifically assessed under Cost/Price



PRAG Questionnaire

- Questions for each subfactor
- Magnitude and types of work performed
- Responses maintained in PRAG Notebooks

PRAG ATTACHMENT 01.5
PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE
When Filled In This Document Is Source Selection Sensitive
Information IAW FAR 3.104

A. GENERAL INFORMATION: Please correct any information below known to be inaccurate:
Contractor's Name: _____
Point of Contact: _____ Telephone Number: _____
Contract Number Provided by Officer: _____ Dollar Amount: _____
Contract Period or Dates of Performance Provided by Officer: _____
Brief Description of Work: _____

Contractor Performed as the ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Joint Venture Partner ☐ Subcontractor
(If Joint Venture Partner specifically identify the managing partner and other partners; if Subcontractor, identify Prime Contractor).

B. RESPONDENT INFORMATION:
Name of Respondent: _____ Title: _____
Address: _____
Telephone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____
Email Address: _____

C. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION: Mark the column that corresponds to the numbers and descriptions in the table below to describe the contractor's performance.

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Unsatisfactory Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. There were serious problems, some of which were not corrected. There were serious problems and the contractor's corrective actions were ineffective.	Marginal Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. There were problems, some of which were not corrected. There were serious problems and the contractor's corrective actions were marginally effective.	Satisfactory Performance met most contractual requirements. There were some minor problems. Corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.	Very Good Performance met all contractual requirements and exceeded some to the government's benefit. There were a few minor problems which the contractor resolved in a timely effective manner.	Exceptional Performance met all contractual requirements and exceeded many to the government's benefit. Problems, if any, were negligible and were resolved in a timely, highly effective manner.	Not Applicable No portion of performance is the result of innovation.

8

Innovations and Efficiencies
(B) Delivered proposed savings and efficiency commitments.
(C) Identified and achieved additional advantages that reduced cost and improved processes resulting in tangible benefits.

9

Attn: Mr. John Sutton
100 Kindel Drive Suite A-337
Arnold AFB, TN 37389-1337

10



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

- Past Performance Volume
 - Contracts Identified by Offeror: 00
 - Total CPARs Reviewed: 0
 - Questionnaires Sent: 00
 - Questionnaires Returned / No. of Contracts: 00/00
 - Telephone Interviews: 00

- PRAG Identified Contracts
 - Contracts: 0
 - CPARs Reviewed: 0
 - Telephone Scope Validation: 0
 - Questionnaires Sent / No. of Contracts: 0/0
 - Questionnaires Returned / No. of Contracts: 0/0
 - Telephone Interviews: 0



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

MISSION CAPABILITY RELEVANCY

	S1 -1	S1 -2	S1 -3	S1 -4	S1 -5	P	S2 -1	S2 -2	S2 -3	P	S3 -1	S 3- 2	S3- 3	S 3- 4	S3- 5	P
#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
VR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SW R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SW R	R	R	R	R	SW R	VR	R	R	N	R	VR	SWR	R	SWR	SWR
	RELEVANT						RELEVANT				RELEVANT					



The Offeror 1 Group *Past Performance*

COST RELEVANCY

	Cost Relevancy	PRAG Cost Relevancy
#	0	0
VR	0	0
R	0	0
SW R	0	0
NR	0	0
	R	SWR
	RELEVANT	



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

Subfactor 1

Relevant Very Good Quality

- *Include an explanation of what drove the PRAG to the initial evaluation assessment for this subfactor*



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

Subfactor 2

Relevant Very Good Quality

- *Include an explanation of what drove the PRAG to the initial evaluation assessment for this subfactor*



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

Subfactor 3

Relevant Exceptional Quality

- *Include an explanation of what drove the PRAG to the initial evaluation assessment for this subfactor*



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

Cost

Relevant

Exceptional Quality

- *Include an explanation of what drove the PRAG to the initial evaluation assessment for this subfactor*



The Offeror 1 Group Past Performance

Based upon Offeror 1's Relevant Subfactor 1, Subfactor 2, Subfactor 3, and Cost past performance assessments in combination with Very Good to Exceptional quality, little doubt exists that Offeror 1 can perform the required effort.

**Confidence Assessment:
Significant Confidence**

Unclassified



The Offeror 1 Group

COST/PRICE



The Offeror 1 Group

Cost/Price

Proposed Amounts

Phase-in	\$	0
Task 1 Cost	\$	0
Task 1 Award Fee		0
Task 1 Price	\$	0
Task 2 Cost	\$	0
Task 2 Award Fee		0
Task 2 Price	\$	0

Total Price \$ 0

Award Fee Percentage 0%



The Offeror 1 Group Cost/Price

	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>MPC Adj.</u>	<u>Govt. MPC</u>
Phase-in	\$ 0	(\$ 0) (1)	\$ 0
Task 1	\$ 0	\$ 0 (1)	\$ 0
Task 2	\$ 0	\$ 0 (1),(2)	\$ 0
Totals	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

- (1) Adjustments due to using incorrect rate tables for the period of performance
- (2) MPC cannot be determined due to insufficient design solution



The Offeror 1 Group

Cost/Price


Task 1 Cost Element Breakdown

	Amount
Prime Labor	\$ 0
Subcontractors	0
Prime Burdens	0
Subtotal Cost	\$ 0
Award Fee	0
Reimbursable Costs	0
Other Direct Costs	0
Total Task 1 Price	\$ 0



The Offeror 1 Group Cost/Price

Distribution of Hourly Wage Rates by Bid No. of FTEs





The Offeror 1 Group *Cost/Price*

Task 2 Cost Element Breakdown

	Amount	
Prime Labor	\$	0
Subcontractors		0
Prime Burdens		0
Subtotal Cost	\$	0
Award Fee		0
Reimbursable Material		0
Reimbursable Travel		0
Other Direct Costs		0
Total Task 1 Price	\$	0



The Offeror 1 Group

Cost/Price

Other Pricing Data:

Total Direct Labor Hours Bid Task 1	0
Total Direct Labor Hours Bid Task 2	0
FTEs on Task 1	0.0
Team Average Unburdened Rate/Hour	\$00.00
Team Average Burdened Rate/Hour	\$00.00
Average Team Burden Markup on Total Wages	000.0%
Award Fee Percentage	0.0%

Subcontractors Include Profit in Their Rates:

Yes/No



The Offeror 1 Group *Cost/Price*

Price Reasonableness Evaluation:

Price Considered Reasonable because:

- Adequate Price Competition
- Proposed Prices Are Consistent With the Government Estimate
- Proposed quantities and mix of labor is acceptable
- Proposed average team wage rates, burden factors, and award fee rates are price competitive.

Price Considered Not Reasonable because:

- Task 2 Purchased Materials. Some items omitted or were in insufficient quantities.
- Task 2 estimate requires re-engineering, consequently the Government cannot rely on the proposed price being accurate

Overall Government Assessment of Proposal:

- Offeror 1 Price is **Reasonable**



The Offeror 1 Group *Cost/Price*

Price Realism Evaluation:

Price Considered Realistic because:

- Task 1 Proposed XX.X FTEs is acceptable

Price Considered Not Realistic because:

- Task 2 Purchased Materials. Some items omitted or were in insufficient quantities.
- Due to the inadequate engineering solution on Task 2, the Government cannot rely on the proposed price as being sufficient to meet the requirement.

Overall Government Assessment of Proposal:

- Offeror 1 Price is **Not Realistic**



The Offeror 1 Group *Cost/Price*

Other Proposal Information:

- Offers to provide \$1M in laboratory, telecommunications, and office equipment funded through previous company profits
 - No costs for these items are proposed to be capitalized or charged back to the contract through indirect cost accounting.
- Offeror 1 offers to cap G&A rates at 5%, however, 6% is used to develop the proposed prices

Unclassified



The Offeror 1 Group

CONTRACTS



The Offeror 1 Group Contracts

- Schedule B Phase-in CLIN Blank
- Met all terms and conditions



Unclassified

The Offeror 1 Group Evaluation Matrix Summary

	Management	Phase-In	Task 2
Mission Capability	Blue	Green	Blue
Proposal Risk	Low	Moderate	Low
Past Performance Significant Confidence			
Cost/Price \$2,219,953		MPC \$2,310,249	



Repeat for each offeror



SUMMARY



Evaluation Summary

	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 3	Offeror 4	Offeror 5	Offeror 6	Etc.
Subfactor 1	Blue	Green	Yellow	Red	Blue	Red	Yellow
Proposal Risk	L	M	M	H	L	H	H
Subfactor 2	Blue	Green	Yellow	Red	Blue	Red	Yellow
Proposal Risk	L	M	M	H	L	H	H
Subfactor 3	Blue	Green	Yellow	Red	Blue	Red	Yellow
Proposal Risk	L	M	M	H	L	H	H
Past Performan ce	Significan t Confidenc e	High Confidenc e	High Confidenc e	Significant Confidence	High Confidenc e	Confidenc e	Significan t Confidenc e
Price/Cost	2,219,953	2,691,674	2,173,001	2,501,196	2,641,542	3,494,394	2,026,929
Probable Cost	2,310,249	2,691,674	2,173,001	2,501,196	2,649,042	3,941,257	2,587,506

SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE - SEE FAR

Unclassified



Competitive Range Recommendation

- *APPROVE COMPETITIVE RANGE*
- *RELEASE EVALUATION NOTICES*



BACKUP SLIDES



Mission Capability Rating Definitions

COLOR	RATING	DEFINITION
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds specified minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the Air Force.
Green	Acceptable	Meets specified minimum performance or capability requirements necessary for a acceptable contract performance.
Yellow	Marginal	Does not clearly meet some specified minimum performance or capability requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance, but any proposal inadequacies are correctable.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet specified minimum performance or capability requirements. Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable.



Proposal Risk Assessment Definitions

LOW (L) - Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

MODERATE (M) - Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

HIGH (H) - Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Risk may be unacceptable even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.



Performance Risk Assessment Definitions

HIGH CONFIDENCE - Based on the offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE - Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

CONFIDENCE - Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.



Performance Confidence Assessment Definitions (Con't)

UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE - No performance record identifiable (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii) and (iv)).

LITTLE CONFIDENCE - Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

NO CONFIDENCE - Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.



Cost Criteria

- REASONABLENESS - Evaluate the acceptability of the methodology
- REALISM - Evaluate extent to which proposed costs indicate a clear understanding of RFP requirements, and reflect sound approach to satisfying those requirements
- PROBABLE COST (PC) COMPUTED BY THE GOVERNMENT – Best estimate of the cost most likely to result from the offeror's proposal



Recency

RECENCY - The PRAG considered contracts where work was performed during the last three (3) years